

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)  
Interim United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CABN 193425)  
Assistant United States Attorneys

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7102  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234  
E-mail: julie.arbuckle@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No. 3 07 70011 JL
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	STIPULATION AND <del>[PROPOSED]</del>
	)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
v.	)	
	)	
VERNON WHITE,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

On February 20, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from February 20, 2007 to March 15, 2007 for effective preparation of and continuity of counsel. The parties represented that there is good cause for granting the continuance, and that it was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See

18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
Interim United States Attorney

DATED: February 23, 2007

/s/  
JULIE A. ARBUCKLE  
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: February 28, 2007

/s/  
STEVEN KALAR  
Attorney for Defendant Vernon White

As the Court found on February 20, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from February 20, 2007 to March 15, 2007 for good cause and the effective preparation and continuity of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 16, 2007

Maria-Elena James  
United States Magistrate Judge

